Post Transition IANA Community Board proposal

The Integrated model lists one possible way of distributing the community board. In this example, it allows for 3-5 votes per operational community according to their own multistakeholder appointment process - though they can field a bigger group of participants if necessary and have normalized representation.   Of course the Community Board could be expanded. One of the requirements in the model for accountability checks and balances to work is parity among the operational communities. How each of them parses their votes, and in our case how ICANN does it, is not determined in the model.

In the Integrated IANA model, that question is left up to each of the operational communities and the way on which they pick their representatives to the Community Board[1]. This subsidiarity of the operational communities means the proposal needs to include a decision on how to constitute the ICANN portion of the Community Board.

Considerations

How we in ICANN decide to establish the Community Board would be up to the CWG to propose. There are modes that are multistakeholder (e.g. 5 votes distributed across the SOs and ACs, perhaps with some rotation) or we could have a mode where there were only 3 votes (1 to each registry type and one to the rest of the community). In some sense it is a continuation of the MRT discussion over the degree of multistakeholder participation in the Community Board representatives for ICANN.

In the CSC, the Registries seem set to achieve the majority voice as was requested - with an possible understanding that a multistakeholder model could be used when it came to the MRT or MRT like bodies[2]. In terms of the MRT, the mainstream discussion is ongoing: Registries vs. Multistakeholder. The root of this issue concerns the degree to which the gTLD and ccTLD registries as the direct customers are the only relevant customers. Some tend toward a multistakeholder customer view while others argue for direct customer primacy.

The Integrated IANA model does not predicate a particular answer to this dilemma. Our goal was to make a simpler model and to find a path toward resolution on the inside/outside dichotomy. Solving the balance between Registries as 'direct' customers, and a distributed

---

[1] It is possible that the Numbers and Protocols operational community not accept participation in the Community Board. One possible mitigation for this is discussed under the nomcom heading. Stress testing would need to be done however, to check whether there would still be sufficient check and balances in the model with ICANN selections filling the Community Board. Other mitigations might be required.

[2] the Post Transition IANA community board is a derivative from the MRT model. Most of the discussions that have been held on the MRT would apply to deciding on how ICANN would represent itself in the PRI Community board.

multistakeholder model, remains to be resolved. We offer one way to think about it, but it is not a structural element of the model or of any of the configurations.

It is also important to remember that this Board has very little to do with the SLAs themselves and is more about budget, continuity and exceptions processing. Day to day SLA management/assessment will be dealt with by the CSC in ICANN and the IANA functions team (and similarly between the CSC equivalents and the IANA functions team with the numers and protocols communties)

Determining the SLAs for ICANN would most probably be primarily a Registry affair and would be monitored by the Registry dominant CSC.

Use of a CWG to support and select the Community Board representatives

One possibility is to use a CWG, perhaps even this CWG or a derivation (e.g. an Implementation Review Team - IRT) as the support for the Community Board function. The ICANN voting members of the Community Board could be selected by the CWG from among its participants.

Nomcom as a selection method

As suggested on the CWG Stewardship mailing list, though in a different context, a nomcom process could be used to select the members of the Community Review Board representing ICANN. The ICANN Nomcom is a well established part of ICANN that is constantly improving and trusted by many, though not all, to balance ICANN needs among its leaders. While not a necessary component of an ICANN solution for selecting the voting members of the Community Board, it might be an existing component that can be used.